India

FOR THE

No. 94. New Series.]
No. 188. Old Series.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1899.

[Registered as a Newspaper.

Price...... 2d.
By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 189
That "Melancholy Meanness" ... 192
A Not too Innocent Abroad 193
The People of India: Their many merits by many who have known them 194
Notes from Bombay 196
Agricultural Indebtedness in India: Speech by Lord Curzon... 197
The Rangoon Outrage. Opinions of the Press in India 197
The Indian Excise Laws 198
Mr. Romesh Dutt on the Indian Epics 199
The Civil Service of India... 199
Public Meetings on Indian Questions. The Work of the British Committee 199
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 199
Advertisements 200

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE Bombay District Municipal Bill was published in the Bombay *Government Gazette* of September 4, and passed the first reading on September 27. "It has taken nearly ten years to frame and introduce this Bill," said the Hon. Mr. James in his speech introducing it, after a sketch of the history of the system of local self-government in the Bombay Presidency. Yet the Government assumed that three weeks was enough for the people affected by it to make up their minds on its provisions and to represent their opinions to the authorities for the enlightenment of the Select Committee on the Bill. Struck by this absurdity of official haste, the Bombay Presidency Association requested the Governor's Legislative Council to postpone the first reading "till the end of January next when the Government will be in Bombay, while not in any way delaying the final passing of the Bill," so as to "ensure a proper understanding of the measure on the part of the public and enable his Excellency's Legislative Council to be fully informed of the views and wishes of the public, as also of the Municipalities concerned." The request was a most reasonable one. Not only is the Bill long and complicated, but it had not been translated into the vernacular, so that the vast number of people unacquainted with the English language could not possibly have any intelligent opinion on the subject. The request, however, was not acceded to.

In accordance with these sensible views, the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas K. Parekh had given notice of an amendment to postpone the first reading for four months, but he withdrew it at the Council table. The Hon. Mr. James gilded his pill pretty dexterously, and administered it with professional blandness. Local self-government? Oh, yes, an admirable institution; "I may take the opportunity of saying that, personally, I think that Lord Ripon's policy is working out, if slowly and steadily, still most satisfactorily, both in the direction of the improvement of municipal administration and in the training of citizens to manage their local affairs." And so, as in the protestation of the Hon. Mr. Baker the other day, the personal opinion somehow gets interwoven with the Council opinion in unwary minds. Of course there is no idea of pulling up the plant of self-government by the roots to see how it is getting on, or to stop its getting on; the great thing is improvement. Well, the principal point of improvement in the Bill, according to Mr. James, is the revival of the distinction between city and town municipalities, which was done away with in the Act of 1884. Accordingly the Bill provides that in city municipalities an executive officer may be appointed, legally empowered to carry out most of the details of the Act, in subordination of course (but Calcutta knows differently) to the municipality.

Again, the Bill formally revives the old managing Committees, on the analogy of the Town Council, or Standing Committee, providing at the same time for schools and other committees, when needed; but some modification of duties is foreshadowed. For out-of-the-way and backward places, a less elaborate machinery is provided. As to the elective process:—

> We follow the practice in the United Kingdom and the City of Bombay of providing that when once an electoral roll has been completed no one shall go behind it, and we are also providing against corruption at elections. Otherwise we leave the law as to elections as we found it.

And so there are beneficent provisions enabling municipalities to recover their taxes (which seem to have fallen into "terrible" arrear "in some places"), provisions about sanitation, butchers' shops, greengroceries, etc.; and, withal, "while we have made clear, and in some cases extended, the powers of municipalities, we have also made every endeavour to consult the just convenience of the ratepayers." "But I wish," said the Hon. Mr. N. G. Chandavarkar, "the Bill were as good as its mover."

It goes without saying that, as some of the Indian critics admitted, there are good points and real improvements in the Bill. These constitute the jam of the dose. But when one gets to the essential principles of the Bill one may well ask, with Mr. Chandavarkar, "whether it does not really aim at pulling up the tree of local self-government planted some nine years ago by the roots, and planting another instead." It looks like the Calcutta plan over again. Mr. Chandavarkar touched several of the main points. The Bill offers official sympathy and support, yet "at almost every step" it requires "the previous sanction of the Collector" or of some other external authority. "Practically municipalities will be officially-ridden bodies under this measure." Said Mr. Chandavarkar:—

> If the people are to get local self-government, let them get the substance, however small, and not the shadow of it; let not what is given, however small, be a caricature of it. And I think that when you create local bodies for the management of local concerns and then subject them to the constant control of the Commissioner and the Collector, you give the people not self-government, but create what is in reality a department of the Government itself.

Then, turning to the other cardinal principle embodied in section 25, "whereby managing committees are to consist, for the first time in the history of local self-government, of elected members and of members nominated officially," Mr. Chandavarkar passed this just criticism:—

> This is an innovation which strikes at the root of the principle of local self-government, and I can see no valid ground on which it can be justified. In fact, tested by the consideration on which I have dwelt, the Bill gives an official colouring to the constitution of our district municipalities and withdraws from them rights which they have enjoyed under the Municipal Act of 1884. That, I strongly maintain, is not local self-government, whatever other name it may deserve.

These criticisms point to a repetition of the Calcutta process of repression. We reserve comment till the Bill comes to hand.

The *Times of India* has a long article on the new Bill for regulating District Municipalities in Bombay. Its support is of so mild a nature that it seems inclined "to damn with faint praise." But in another part of the paper it gives vent to more decided opinions. After the experience of Calcutta it is not surprising that all meddling with municipalities should be looked on with suspicion by the Indians, or that they should cry in regard to the new Bill:—"Too much Government intervention, too much official control." And evidently the great organ of the Government, of which we have already spoken, thinks there is something in their criticisms. It says:—

> Government will do well to see how far, without sacrificing any guarantee for efficient administration, they can remove reasonable suspicions of this nature. The intervention of the Commissioner in the selection of the managing committee is a device which is particularly complained of. Is this a proposal upon which no compromise is possible? If a Mofussil municipality is capable of exercising any powers at all, it ought to be trusted to choose the best men from amongst its number for the more responsible duties imposed upon a managing committee. A little more freedom here might go a long way towards gaining public favour for a measure which will be better worked if it be made palatable to the people.

These are wise words indeed. Our contemporary goes on to call for further information before the Bill is proceeded with.

To those who have followed the events which led to the resignation of a majority of the elected members of the Calcutta Corporation the remarks in the *Pioneer* are almost sublime in their audacity, for it speaks of the Government's "firm but civil refusal to prolong controversy over the unanswered charges" contained in Sir A. Mackenzie's speech. "Unanswered charges," when the very complaint of the Corporation is that the Government will not give particulars of the charges and so render an answer possible! It is, however, noticeable that the *Pioneer* suggests in the concluding sentence of its article not that the "good-natured and well-meaning talkers" of the Corporation were themselves corrupt, but that they were influenced by corrupt persons, presumably outside. This is a somewhat new version of the charge. Our contemporary can hardly expect us to take seriously the woes of "British merchants, who have hitherto been excluded from their proper share in the direction of municipal affairs," and who it seems are willing to resume "their proper share" only on payment of Rs. 32 per sitting. Yet this is one of its main arguments in support of the new Act.

At the time of writing it is still uncertain what action will be taken by the Indian Parliamentary Committee with reference to the debate on the Address. The uncertainty arises in part from the fact that the Government has not yet announced whether at the conclusion of the present sitting Parliament will be adjourned or prorogued. If it be adjourned there will, of course, be no Queen's Speech when the adjourned sittings are taken next year and consequently no debate on the Address. If, on the other hand, Parliament be prorogued, there will be a debate on the Address next February as usual. Meantime, however, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, Sir William Wedderburn has given notice of an amendment which if necessary he is prepared to move at once. It calls attention to the two main points arising out of the despatch of British soldiers from India to South Africa: namely (1) that no charge in respect of such troops while they are absent from India should fall upon the Indian taxpayers; and (2) that no future charge should be made upon the Indian taxpayers in respect of troops which are plainly not required for the defence of India. We deal with this matter at some length on another page. It may, we should hope, be assumed that the British Government has no intention of committing the "melancholy meanness" of charging India with any part of the cost of the South African contingent during its absence from India. But the point of real importance is the second. On what reasonable ground can we require India to maintain a reserve force for Imperial purposes, whose expenses are to be defrayed from the Imperial Exchequer only during the recurrent periods in which they are actually engaged in the field?

We have commented more than once upon the plague policy adopted at Belgaum. Our vigorous contemporary the Bombay *Champion* now sets forth some astonishing facts as to the enforcement of inoculation in that ill-starred town. True, in answer to a series of questions put by Mr. Shripad Anant Chhatre in the Bombay Legislative Council Lord Sandhurst has committed himself to the statement that "there is no such thing at Belgaum as compulsory inoculation." But the *dictum* seems to have been modelled in substance as well as in form upon another official statement—that "there is no *affaire Dreyfus*." To quibble about what is and what is not compulsion, there is no end. The *Champion* puts the matter in a nutshell when it says:—

> If by the word is meant catching hold of a person and thrusting serum into his body, then of course Lord Sandhurst's statement is absolutely accurate. But if by "compulsory" is meant offering an inducement of a character which practically leaves no option, then His Excellency's statement is based on wrong information.

Our contemporary adds detailed facts which go to show that unhaply Indian residents at Belgaum are required to choose between (1) inoculation and (2) expulsion from their homes by the police. If this is not compulsory inoculation one can only say that it is a very fair imitation of it. Now inoculation against plague may be good or it may be futile. But inoculation under threats is undoubtedly a political danger of a serious kind, and we should have thought that Lord Sandhurst had had enough experience of plague administration in the Bombay Presidency to appreciate the fact. There is a serum which is quite as potent as Haffkine's. It is called conciliation.

Those who have criticised Mr. Mehta's letter on the plague regulations at Matheran seemed to have missed one of the chief points in his case. On what ground is the different treatment of Indians and Europeans justified? One answer is that Europeans are not subject to plague. Even Sir Reginald Hart is said to have committed himself to this view, though it is hard to believe it. Anyway, it is a view that can no longer be maintained. The sad death of Nurse Murphy at Belgaum has been followed by a series of cases at Poona. Miss Windle and Miss Burnett have died there, while Mrs. Kennedy has recovered, and Mrs. Spence and Mrs. Dalton were still in hospital when the last mail left. Elsewhere the Rev. Father Tabourel, a European priest, has been attacked. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Venice regulations make no difference between Europeans and Asiatics. But if Europeans are thus capable of contracting the disease and carrying the infection, why are they to be treated differently in India? No doubt they are very much less likely to bring infection than the wretched dwellers in the slums of Indian cities; but this applies also to the wealthier Indians. Why then are not the latter saved from the more disagreeable plague rules as well as the Europeans? It is no doubt true that an appeal has been made to educated Indians to show a good example to their more ignorant fellow-countrymen by cheerfully submitting to the same plague regulations. But would not the example of Europeans also submitting be at least as efficacious? If there is to be discrimination, let it be according to probability of carrying infection and not according to colour. If there is to be no discrimination, let the Englishman and the Indian unite in submission for the public good.

Mr. Kelkar's letter to the *Times of India* on the sanitation of Poona raises some interesting questions. The recurrence of plague in that unfortunate city has led many to turn their attention to the subject, and as usual it has been commonly held that drains and sewerage are at the root of the evil. But Mr. Kelkar points out that the average death-rate at Poona for the fourteen years before 1896 was only 26·21 per thousand, less than that of eleven of the larger cities of the Presidency, including Bombay. Thus till lately Poona had a good reputation, and the fault must be sought in some new elements. These according to Mr. Kelkar are "(1) percolations into the subsoil from the Khadakwasla Canal, which runs along the city at a higher level; and (2) the absence of any adequate system of surface water drainage." The *Times of India* recalls that the late Dr. Manser also held "that the former healthiness of Poona had been ruined by the saturation consequent upon the introduction of an excessive water-supply without any simultaneous provision having been made for subsoil drainage." Our contemporary is inclined to agree with Mr. Kelkar and Dr. Manser, and to attribute to this the marked deterioration in the public health of the three chief towns of the Presidency—Bombay, Kurrachee, and Poona.

Two cases which excited much public interest have just been decided. In the first Mr. Falckytter, the manager of a plantation, who was accused of causing the death of a coolie, has been acquitted. But is it kind of the *Madras Mail* to add: "The coolie is believed to have died from a ruptured spleen"? In the second case, known as "the Ranigunge murder," eleven Indians were tried on charges of murder, culpable homicide and rioting, all being acquitted on the first counts, and five acquitted and six convicted on the charge of rioting. These were sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. This is the case in which the manager of a paper mill, Mr. Ironside, met his death, the affray having arisen, as the judge believed, owing to the fault of Mr. Williams, another European connected with the mill.

Here the matter might be allowed to rest, were it not for a letter in the *Englishman*, the writer of which complains that the result of the Ranigunge case is a serious miscarriage of justice, which he attributes to the trial having taken place before an Indian judge, Mr. Gupta, and an Indian jury. Yet if a European judge and jury are accused of defeating the ends of justice by acquitting a European, how indignant does our contemporary, which

prints this letter, become. The acquittals of Englishmen accused of assaulting Indians not in one or two instances, but in case after case, makes it, indeed, difficult always to maintain a becoming restraint, but we believe that most of our Indian contemporaries and we ourselves have endeavoured to avoid calling in question the acquittal of any individual. Even in the Rangoon case anger at the miscarriage of justice involved in no one being made amenable has not made us claim that this prisoner or that should have been declared guilty. We have always declined to usurp the functions of the jury. Now this is exactly what the writer in the *Englishman* does. He goes on, and this is a matter more open to the judgment of the press, to criticise Mr. Gupta's summing-up and sentence. The former is happily reported at considerable length in several papers and speaks for itself as a careful and impartial presentation of the case to the jury. As to the sentence of two years' rigorous imprisonment, since the prisoners were convicted only on a minor count of the indictment, it does not seem to err on the side of leniency. Many Europeans convicted of more serious charges have received much less punishment.

We referred last week to the complaint brought by Bhai Kaur Singh, a *Granthi*, that he had been caned by Lieutenant Villiers Stuart at Abbottabad because he had failed to salute that officer. The gallant Lieutenant has now paid the complainant Rs. 50 compensation and apologised, and the complaint has been withdrawn. Bhai Kaur Singh, however, has sent a memorial to the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief in which, after giving a history of the affair, and pointing out that many who passed through Cantonments might fail to salute from ignorance—he himself seems to have been absorbed in thought—he ends with the following quaint prayer :—

> I, therefore, humbly solicit your Excellency's favour of issuing orders that no European officer should thrash any person for not saluting him, and for this act of favour I shall ever pray, etc.

At the other extremity of India, in Madras, the *Hindu* and the *Madras Mail* are disputing whether a certain official did not thrash a man who on a festive occasion approached with his boots on. Might not the desired order against thrashing be made more general?

Crime continues to increase in the Punjab, and the criminal outstrips the policeman in skill. The *Times of India* does not hide its belief that "the police are inefficient and untrustworthy because they are badly paid, and the prospects of advancement are insufficient." The *Tribune* has arrived at the same opinion, which indeed is held universally, but it insists that the Indian police officers can never be expected to show all the ability and energy of which they are capable while they are denied promotion to the higher ranks, and after years of service may find themselves under the orders of young men whom they have themselves taught and trained. Mr. Cunningham, the Commissioner of Peshawar, points out another cause of disorganisation in the frequent changes of police officers, the same evil that has been so often attacked in the revenue department. Here is what he says :—

> Without continuity of *personnel* we cannot hope to get real aid from the leading Native gentlemen. It is not to be expected that a *jagirdar*, or big khan, in the country will risk incurring the enmity of bad characters all round, unless he has some security that the officer who has asked his help, and has won his confidence, will probably remain long enough to protect him from the friends of those whom he may have helped to bring to punishment.

The *Times of India* hopes that this latter reform may be accomplished by Lord Curzon.

There is no more definite news of the progress of the famine; only a general indication that the pressure is growing ever more severe. The spasmodic rains have done but little for the Central Provinces, where "relief expenditure," says the *Times*' Simla correspondent (Oct. 13), "has already been sanctioned up to 10 lakhs of rupees, as well as loans amounting to 3¼ lakhs," and "the local programme for the current year provides for works which will employ nearly 400,000 persons on relief for three months." But it is hoped that previous experience will not be forgotten in fixing the rate per head. In the Punjab, where several districts suffer grievously, 21 lakhs is the estimate of relief expenditure during the current year; and over 60,000 persons are already on relief works, while arrangements have been made for a much larger strain, *inter alia* by sanction of four railway schemes. In the northern division of Bombay, parts of which are severely affected, some 40,000 persons are on relief works —two railways being sanctioned, and other works being contemplated—while the Government estimate runs to provision for employment of 95,000 for three months.

The Simla correspondent of the *Times* anticipated (Oct. 13) that the principal area of suffering would be Rajputana, "in many parts of which the scarcity exceeds any that has occurred since 1868-69." In Ajmere-Marwar it is proposed to advance a Government loan of some 50 lakhs; and the Viceroy is going there to inspect the relief works and to consult with the local officers. In no case is it intended to take the responsibility out of the hands of Durbars (!); we are simply going to supply "expert advice." We shall hope that the officials deputed to convey this expert advice are men of tact and sympathy as well as of famine code learning. Generally, we are told that "experience gained in the last famine and the Report of the Famine Commission have been of great value in formulating the new programme." They certainly ought to have been so but, after the outcome of previous famines, one is in no great hurry to accept the assurance. So when the *Times*' Simla correspondent concludes with the assertion that

> these facts show that the Government of India are fully alive to their responsibilities, and that a uniform and carefully thought-out plan of campaign is already in execution in all the affected parts of India,

one can only hope fervently that it is so. Time alone can tell.

The district of Nellore, which adjoins the Deccan districts, has come to be an almost annual cause of anxiety in respect of the need of relief. Mr. Mullaby, the Acting Collector, in his report on the "distress" of 1897-98, says the land is poor and the people are equally "poor and resourceless." The *Hindu*, commenting on the Report, makes the following general and special remarks :—

> The facts, however, still remain undisputed, that the economic condition of the people is so bad as to make them feel they are deprived of all resisting power even against a partial failure of the monsoon, and that the bulk of them can escape starvation only by falling into the clutches of the money-lenders, by joining the criminal gangs, or by resorting to the relief works. In the case of Nellore, the difficulty was not that there were no grains, for the improved methods of communication could flood the district with a plentiful stock from the neighbouring ones, which were not affected, but that the people had been left no money in the shape of savings wherewith to purchase food.

The means of bringing back a measure of prosperity to the inhabitants have over and over again been set out in these columns, and they will have to be attended to, one day, before the mischief can be remedied. And here, be it observed, is a district "distress" affecting over half a million people, and known in this country only by its turning up in an official report months after all was over.

The *Times of India* speaks rather kindly of the experiment initiated by the Akalkot Agricultural Syndicate for the amelioration of the condition of the local agriculturists by the purchase and supply of seeds and plough cattle for rayats in need of help, and the advance of small loans either free or at low interest. Akalkot is a tiny State with a population of half-a-lakh, and the experiment applies to but a small portion even of its small territory. Our contemporary, though doubtful whether an experiment of this kind will go far, still "must welcome it not only as a manifestation of philanthropic spirit of a peculiarly interesting and beneficial kind, but as one amongst many calls to the Government of India, when the opportunity offers, again to endorse the principle which it favoured twelve years ago." The *Times of India* had previously said :—

> When experiments in assisting agriculture are made even on a small scale in India, we are reminded of an enterprise, the inception of which especially belongs to this Presidency, and which but for an unforeseen act of impolitic discouragement would have been put to the test long ago. We are not often in agreement with Sir William Wedderburn, but he was certainly engaged in a good work when some years ago he was strenuously labouring for the acceptance of the principle of Agricultural Banks. His labours so far succeeded that the Bombay Government and the Government of India committed themselves to the experimental institution of an Agricultural Bank under State control in a selected Taluka of this Presidency. The unexplained opposition of the Secretary of State prevented the experiment from ever being entered upon.

We shall be much interested in the conduct and results of the Akalkot experiment.

THAT "MELANCHOLY MEANNESS."

INDIA, we suppose, must have an army—a visible sign of the physical force at the back of the civil authority—just like all other countries that seem worth keeping or taking. Even if India were cast loose from Great Britain she would no doubt maintain an army of her own. But in any case the question will always present itself, whether the army is reasonably adequate to its purpose or unreasonably large. The British Government has drafted off some 10,000 troops from Indian stations to the Transvaal campaign—at a chance time, for a chance period; and the fact would seem to show that, in the opinion of the British Government, these 10,000 troops are really capable of being spared from India. If this be the case, then it would seem to follow, not only that the British Government should charge the Imperial revenues with the whole of the cost of the employment of these troops outside India, but also that the cost of them during their service in India ought not to fall upon the Indian exchequer. It does not appear to be consonant with justice that a force stationed in India for the convenience of Great Britain by way of reserve should be charged to the revenues of India.

There is no doubt, as we have already said, that India can perfectly well spare these 10,000 men. The fact of the matter is that the calculations of the authorities do not require them in India at all. Does the justice-loving and justice-exalting British public know this? Have the daily and weekly organs of public opinion in Great Britain explained this to the ardent "trustees" of the great dependency? In round figures we have now an army in India consisting of 74,000 British troops and 146,000 Native troops, a proportion of 1 to 2. Before the Mutiny the proportion was 1 to 5, and sometimes even considerably less; and but for the characteristic carelessness of our officials for Indian susceptibilities there would have been no Mutiny, nor would there have been any reason for raising the proportion. On a sober study of the facts of the situation there was really no solid ground for raising the proportion after the Mutiny; and if it was judiciously raised for a time it might very well have been decreased—and materially decreased—decades ago. However, the Royal Commission of Enquiry in 1859 submitted in its Report this recommendation:—

> As regards . . . . the proportion which Europeans should bear to Native corps in cavalry, infantry, and artillery respectively, your Majesty's Commissioners are of opinion that the amount of Native force should not, under present circumstances, bear a greater proportion to the European, in cavalry and infantry, than 2 to 1 for Bengal and 3 to 1 for Madras and Bombay respectively.

"Under present circumstances," the Commissioners said; and we imagine they had in view the disturbed condition of the country, and anticipated that by-and-by some reduction would be possible in quieter times. However, the proportion was put at 2 to 1 on the whole, and there it still stands—the differential proportions recommended for Bombay and Madras not being strictly regarded. Professor Gokhale, in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure (April 12-13, 1897), showed that the excess of British troops in India over the Commissioners' standard was then 11,338. Thus:—

	Native Troops.	British Troops.	Excess of British Troops over the Accepted Standard.
Bengal (½) ..	84,614 ..	46,379 ..	4,072
Madras (⅓) ..	32,306 ..	14,195 }	7,266
Bombay (⅓) ..	28,878 ..	13,466 } ..	
			11,338

So, of course, the Indian army could spare 10,000 men, and India still be saddled with an excess of 1,338! In view of the settled condition of the country, there ought to have been a vast reduction many years ago—except for specifically Imperial objects. "As it is," said Professor Gokhale, "we have on our hands a force of more than 11,000 British troops, and taking the cost per European combatant at Rs. 1,413 a year, we see this excess force burdens our military Budget with a needless 1⅔ crores (or, more exactly, Rs. 1,57,30,000)." It is curious to observe that 1⅔ crores is the very amount anticipated as required to meet the cost of famine within the current financial year—an amount that is rendering the authorities nervous. Will Great Britain recognise her duty, then, and pay over the sums thus extorted from the Calcutta Treasury? Or will she send over another half-million subscription, and complacently exult in her generosity?

But Mr. Gokhale goes two steps farther. We shall at present content ourselves with one:—

> The strength of our existing army is, further, in excess, by the recent increase of 30,000 troops, of the military needs of the country, as laid down by the Army Commission of 1879, who even contemplated among other things, in framing their estimate of our requirements, "the contingency of operations beyond the frontier, not merely against Russia with Afghanistan as our ally, but against Russia assisted by Afghanistan," and, as Mr. Ilbert and Sir A. Colvin in their dissent point out, no circumstances have risen which necessitated these augmentations.

We see, then, how these 10,000 troops can be spared from India. They have been a mere imposition on the Indian finances. It seems to be of no use whatever to protest. When one of the Native members of the Viceroy's Council spoke of the reduction of the British troops in India—in the last debate on the Indian Budget, if we remember rightly—Lord Curzon declared emphatically that there should be no reduction—"not by a single soldier"—in his time at least. In our issue of March 18, 1898 (pp. 167-8), we showed how the see-saw of protest and encroachment between the Indian and the British authorities has been going on since 1860: "a steady stream of protest from the Indian authorities, ineffectual; a steady increase of the claims of the Imperial Government, successful." It will require the intervention of the British public to compel British statesmen to bring the scales of justice even. But for that desirable result we must wait till our great journals diffuse the necessary knowledge of the facts.

Now, what about the employment of these 10,000 nominally Indian troops in South Africa? The question brings us back to Mr. Morley's great speech on his amendment to Lord George Hamilton's motion on July 6, 1896, to charge India with the ordinary expenses of the Indian contingent despatched to Suakin. The motion was necessitated by Section 55 of the Act of 1858 (21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106), to the effect that the revenues of India cannot, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applied to defray the expense of any military operation beyond the frontiers of that country. Mr. Morley recalled "the weighty language used by Lord Hartington in 1882":—

> Lord Hartington said that there were two objects in Section 55. The first was to prevent such a contingency as that the Government should carry on military operations by means of troops maintained on Indian establishments and without having to come to Parliament for its consent at all. . . . . But Lord Hartington laid down the great constitutional doctrine that it is going beyond the spirit of the 55th Section to do as you did in Mombasa—to use Indian troops outside the frontier and outside the cases excepted in the Act without the consent of Parliament whether you impose a charge on India or whether you do not.

Mr. Morley went on, almost in prophetic spirit, to raise the very point that has now been thrust prominently forward:—

> It is well-known now that there is a strong, and probably a growing, school, who argue that East Africa is to become a sort of annexe of the Indian Empire, and that the real and effective military base of what they expect to be our East African possessions is to be found in India and the Indian army. In these circumstances, and in view of these apprehensions, which the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) shares with some of us, I feel—and many in the House, irrespective of party, will feel—that nothing can be more delicate or more important, in the view not only of the present contingency but the future, than the relations between the Indian army and the Parliament sitting at Westminster. (Cheers.)

And Mr. Morley cited effectively "a perfectly admirable statement of doctrine," made in 1867 by Lord Cranborne (now Lord Salisbury):—

> I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barracks in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have a check upon the temptation to engage in little wars, which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. . . . . If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed.

These points will now come up in Parliament again, and we trust that they will be insistently driven home. If there was not a little difficulty in furbishing up an Indian interest in Mombasa, it will be interesting to note the ingenuity that shall discover an Indian interest in the Transvaal conflict.

For, surely, if India is to pay at all, some Indian

interest must be demonstrated. One might imagine so; but one would be completely wrong. In an article on April 8, 1898 (p. 213), we set out the occasions of the British employment of Indian troops outside India since 1859-60, together with the conditions of such employment. The British contribution to the expenses was shown to be variable; but only in two cases have the British Government paid them all, ordinary as well as extraordinary: the China expedition of 1859-60, and the Malta reinforcement of 1878. Even the ordinary expenses of the contingents sent to New Zealand in 1860 and 1861, and to Perak in 1875, as well as to Abyssinia (1867), Egypt (1882), the Soudan (1885), and Suakin (1896), were charged to India. We assume that there is no intention of saddling India with any part of the cost of the present contingent to South Africa. Any such proposal would certainly have been resisted to the utmost. It would have been most grossly unjust. But surely it is time to insist on a definitive settlement of responsibility in these matters. "Millions of money," runs a dispatch of the Government of India dated March 25, 1890, and written in the time of Lord Lansdowne and Lord Roberts—"Millions of money have been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments, and on fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. . . . . It is imperative, in our opinion, that this long-standing question should be settled, and that the people of India, who have no voice in the matter, should not be able to complain that an excessive military tribute is demanded from the revenues of their country." Good for Lords Lansdowne and Roberts! Let us have done with all this most "melancholy meanness."

A NOT TOO INNOCENT ABROAD.[1]

THE Anglo-Indian has always insisted that without long residence in India no one is entitled to speak on Indian questions. It is a position for which there is something to be said, though it may be argued on the other side that the stranger who is well informed without being prejudiced, and who brings a fresh and sympathetic mind to the study, will see much that is hidden from those who pass their lives in a daily routine, and who know a part of their subject so well that they lose the true proportions of the whole. But what is to be said for the writer who begins a short tour in India prejudiced, and ends it ignorant, and who yet does not scruple to bring wholesale charges of corruption and inefficiency against large classes of the people? That Mr. Steevens has remained ignorant of much that is common knowledge one striking example will show. He speaks of "trials for seditious writing and speech, such as those of Tilak and the brothers Natu," though it might be thought impossible for anyone who took the smallest interest in Indian public affairs not to know that the Natus were imprisoned without trial and without being informed of the charge on which they were arrested. That Mr. Steevens entered on his investigations with a strong prejudice may be judged from his first impressions at Bombay, where he describes the Hindu as one "who would like, if only the law would let him, to marry babies and burn widows." The Bengali is the special object of his contempt—chiefly it appears, because he does not like the shape of the Bengali's legs. But it is not thus that the Indian is judged by those who have known him best, still less by those who have stood with him in the extremity of danger. It was not thus that Sir George Robertson judged of the Bengali who had charge of the Commissariat in the siege of Chitral, a man who was no soldier and never hid his fears,

> but lost no man's respect thereby, for his avowed tremors never interfered with duty. A man shot dead along-side of him at the scales probably added no additional shakiness to the figures in the checking book. He crossed dangerous places looking sea-sick, but never thought of shirking the risk. . . . . How we should have got on without this feeble-bodied, weak-nerved individual it is hard to guess.

There are other virtues and heroisms besides those of the soldier, even in the besieged fort and on the stricken field; but that a Bengali could do his duty in spite of danger is beyond the understanding of Mr. Steevens. Has he not the legs of a slave? Yet it may be that we take Mr. Steevens too seriously. His florid style requires the effects of light and shade, and perhaps he does not hesitate to slaughter the reputation of a people to round a period or point a contrast.

The author is not always so dogmatic. In his discussion of frontier policy he gives both sides of the question, and in internal administration he does not hide the fact that he has no great faith in the present system. Our attempt to rule the Indian and raise him to our own august level he speaks as "surely the most audacious, the most heroic, the most lunatic enterprise to which a nation ever set its hand." Of the three great blessings we are supposed to have bestowed on India, Peace, Justice, and Prosperity, he is doubtful whether the two first are such unmitigated advantages as they are thought, while his readers may well have their doubts as to the existence of the third. According to Mr. Steevens, our law-courts are the means by which usurers enforce their debts in a way that was impossible before our time—"in a British court the sacred contract must be upheld and the rayat is ruined." As to the prosperity, Mr. Steevens, seeing that rich Indians are usually fat, infers

> that the hundreds of millions of skeletons are lean because they must—because they live from harvest to seed-time and through to harvest again with bellies half empty.

Yet he believes that in the main the assessments for land revenue are equitable. But as to the equity of the financial relations between the Provinces and the Central Government he has no illusions:—

> The function of Madras is to pay. Its lands are all held direct from the Crown; there is no permanent settlement, and the assessment rises steadily. Madras raises the revenue, and the North spends it.

As to the "tribute" it is only casually alluded to in a discussion on currency by another hand; but Mr. Steevens, who avows his incompetence to deal with that question, nevertheless has the audacity to say: "We make India pay its own way, but beyond that Britain gets not a penny from it for any public purpose." Now, leaving the "tribute" aside if "public" includes "imperial" purposes, this is manifestly absurd. Not only in the past has impoverished India had to lend her troops and pay them, but even now she has to keep up a large army to be used when needed in another quarter of the globe. Of course if Mr. Steevens only means that India does not contribute to the maintenance of a pump at Little Peddlington no one will controvert his statement.

It will be seen that the author, in spite of his contempt for the Congress, finds himself constrained in some points to agree with its views. But there are two points on which in the past Government and Congress have been united where he differs from both. These are European Education and Elected Municipalities. He believes that in both the Government have been on the wrong track, and so far as the latter is concerned rejoices in the Government's tardy repentance. It is scarcely necessary to say that Mr. Steevens makes much of the failings of the municipality of Agra, and is delightfully ignorant of its being one of the few which have the privilege of an official chairman. As to Calcutta he knows more and has therefore to discriminate; but he would perhaps be surprised to find that his suggestion of the advantage of having a Local Government Board to keep local bodies straight as in England originated with that special object of his contempt, a Bengali lawyer. He admits too that Harrison Road, which the present Corporation has made, "is a street to which any city might point proudly." But the Calcutta Corporation's great fault is that having the power to levy a rate of 23 per cent. it raised one only of 19½. We imagine that the readers of the journal wherein the substance of this work originally appeared, accustomed to the diatribes of the Conservative Press against the extravagance of the London County Council, must almost have wished themselves in Calcutta. Happily the author's prophecy that "next year or the next we may hear of thousands on thousands of victims" to the plague in that city has not yet been fulfilled.

Mr. Steevens is very much enraged with the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, if he really opposed strong measures against plague in Calcutta. "The only possible reason for such a refusal would be sheer cowardice—the fear of an agitation in the Native Press and possible riots in the Native quarters; its only possible result would be contempt of government among the governed, and, sooner or later, thousands dead of plague." That to enforce measures which

[1] "In India." By G. W. Steevens. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1899.

outraged the feelings of the people would lead to the concealment of cases and so render the harshest rules ineffective is apparently a thought which never occurred to Mr. Steevens. Yet, with characteristic inconsistency, when he comes to talk of Poona, he admits the unsuitability of soldiers for the work of plague inspection, and complains that their use was rendered necessary by the Indians standing aloof. We believe he is misinformed as to the amount of help rendered from the outset by volunteers at Poona; but what is more absurd than to claim the assistance in one city of those whose opinion is to be disregarded in another? He cries shame on the Lieutenant-Governor for paying attention to Indian opinion in Calcutta, and he regrets that the services of the Indians of Poona were not forthcoming. He must be very ignorant of human nature if he thinks that it is possible to flout men at one moment and make use of them the next. Calcutta learnt from Poona, but some people are incapable of learning.

The author agrees with all other observers, whether hostile or friendly, that as a result of easier communication with England the Anglo-Indian officials are becoming more and more ignorant of the people. Hence there arises a greater need for the co-operation of Indians in administration. "In practice . . . . the actual work of government is almost entirely in Native hands, and largely conducted according to Native methods." But he complains that the Indian judges and officials are for the most part corrupt and inefficient. If they are not so, it is certainly not the fault of the Government. To admit the necessity of employing Indians, but to shut the door of advancement against them, is the way to crush honourable ambition and encourage slothfulness and greed. It is to the honour of the Indian servants of Government that so many English administrators have testified to their honesty. But where they shine most is precisely where they have been put most on an equality with their Anglo-Indian co-workers. Who has aught to allege against the judges of the High Courts? The names of Mitter and Ranade could no more be coupled with the thought of corruption than could those of Coleridge or Russell. According to Mr. Steevens nothing can be done well in India without the European official. Perhaps not, when he is present. But here is what he says of the Native State of Hyderabad:—

> The people are astonishingly well-to-do. A plague officer told me that he visited a small town off the railway, where hardly a white man had ever been, and found there the most prosperous population he ever saw. . . . . These happy villagers, on the first sign of plague, had independently isolated themselves—shut up their houses, and put up a temporary town in the fields.

As to the success of our work in India the author is not enthusiastic. "The Briton was made to do with the barbarian, being—the more you think of it the clearer you see it—half a barbarian himself." And he allows that the Indian is civilised, little as he admires his civilisation. He believes, moreover, that in several matters of the first importance we have gone all wrong. Yet he hopes that by mere persistence in the wrong road all may come right. He recognises many of the evils denounced by the Congress, but he has no remedy. He can foresee no improvement. He can suggest no policy. So that, at the very least, the policy of the Congress holds the field.

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA: THEIR MANY MERITS BY MANY WHO HAVE KNOWN THEM.

Collected and Edited with an Introduction by ALFRED WEBB, *(President Tenth Indian National Congress).*

VI.

COLONEL THOMAS MUNRO. *Thirty-two years service in India.* (*Evidence in* 1813.)

'I do not exactly understand what is meant by the civilisation of the Hindus. In the higher branches of science; in the knowledge of the theory and practice of good government, and in an education which, by banishing prejudice and superstition, open the mind to receive instruction of every kind from every quarter, they are much inferior to Europeans; but if a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to convenience or luxury; schools established in every village, for teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic; the general practice of hospitality and charity among each other; and above all a treatment of the female sex, full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilised people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe; and if civilisation is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country [England] will gain by the import cargo.'—'*Hansard's Debates,' April* 12, 1813.

EARL NORTHBROOK. *Viceroy of India,* 1872-1876.

'I know from experience that the people of India are industrious, orderly, patient in suffering, affectionate to their relations—supporting them in distress to the utmost of their means (there is no Poor Law in India)—and grateful to their rulers for help in time of trouble.'—'*Native Opinion,' Bombay, August* 20, 1899.

SIR HENRY RICKETTS. *Served in or for India,* 1821 *to* 1860; *Member Viceroy's Council.*

'You speak approvingly of the settlements of Cuttick and Chittagong. They were useful works. They have now stood the test of years, and the soundness of the proceedings is more than admitted—it is proved by the condition of the two Provinces and the temper of the inhabitants. But those works were not accomplished, and never could have been accomplished without the assistance of Native officers, without their intelligence, their industry, and their honesty. I emphatically repeat that last word—their honesty. The experience of others may differ from my experience; but wherever I hear of failure in the employment of Native agency I cannot help surmising that there must have been some mistake in the management; for I declare that, throughout my long experience, the more I have trusted Native officers the more faithful they have been found. I do not say that I have never been disappointed, but I hope I have avoided the too common mistake of doubting the many because a few failed.'—'*Admission of Educated Natives into the Indian Civil Service,' Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Bombay,* 1893.

MARQUIS OF RIPON, K.G. *Viceroy of India,* 1880 *to* 1884.

'There is, I fear, much in the conditions of modern life which tends to separate and keep apart the European and Native in this country [India] somewhat more than was the case in former days. The rapidity of communication, the weekly mails, the frequent furloughs, in spite of their numerous advantages, all tend to a certain extent in that direction; and therefore it is a great satisfaction to feel that there are other circumstances connected with our time which may counteract the evil; and among them we may count that greater acquaintance which we possess in the present day with the history, the art, and the jurisprudence of the past, which ought to help us to know better, to appreciate more highly, the native civilisation of India—to feel how ignorant is the inclination to disparage it, and that it is upon the ancient foundations of that civilisation alone that we can hope to erect firm and enduring the superstructure of that wider and higher life which it should be the great aim of our Government to foster and advance.'. . . . 'We are here in the midst of ancient peoples, possessed of civilisation, of literature, of art of their own; and our business is not to try and force them to regret their past, to forget all that is characteristic in their history and their traditions, and to convert themselves into bad imitations of modern Englishmen; but to place without stint, at their disposal, all the riches of Western science and Western culture, that they may blend them in one harmonious union with the treasures of their own Oriental learning.'. . . . [British] 'power and influence rest upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon any other foundation—aye, more than upon the valour of our soldiers and the reputation of our arms. I have heard to-day with no little surprise a very different argument. The Hon. Mr. Thomas, in a speech in which he did his utmost to stir up the bitterness of a controversy which was approaching a settlement, and to fan again the dying embers of race animosity, has asked—was there ever a nation which retained her supremacy by the righteousness of her laws? I have read in a book, the authority of which the Hon. Mr. Thomas will admit, that righteousness exalteth a nation, and my study of history has led me to the conclusion that it is not by the force of her arms or by the might of her soldiery that a great empire is permanently maintained; but that it is by the righteousness of her laws, by her respect for the principle of justice.'—'*Speeches of the Marquis of Ripon in India,*' 2 *vols., Government Printer, Calcutta,* 1883-1884.

SIR THOMAS ROE. *Ambassador to India,* 1614 *to* 1619.

'And here I shall insert another most needful particular to my present purpose, which deserves a most high commendation to be given unto that people' [of India] 'in general, how poor and mean soever they be, and that is, the great exemplary care they manifest in their piety to their *parents*, that, notwithstanding they serve for very little (as I observed before) but five shillings a moon for their whole livelihood and subsistence; yet, if their parents be in want, they will impart at least half of that little towards their necessaries, choosing rather to want themselves, than that their parents should suffer need.' . . . . 'They are a very industrious people, very diligent in all the works of their particular callings, believing that bread is sweetest and most savoury which is gained by sweat.'. . . . 'These are a people who are not afraid *of a lion in the way, of a lion in the streets,* as the slothful man is, Prov. xxvi, 13; but they lay hold on the present time, the opportunity, to set upon

their businesses which they are to do to-day, they being very laborious in their several employments, and very square and exact to make good all their engagements. Which appears much in their justness manifested unto those that trade with them.' . . . . 'Oh, what a sad thing is it for *Christians* to come short of *Indians*, even in *moralities*, come *short* of *those*, who, themselves believe, to come *short* of *Heaven*.'—*'A Relation of Sir Thomas Roe's Voyage in the East Indies,' appended to 'The Travels of Sig. Pietro della Valle, a Noble Roman,'* 1665.

James Routledge. *Correspondent of the 'Times' and Editor of 'Friend of India.'* (*Ob.* 1898.)

'Of the masses of the people' [of India] 'a strange notion prevails in England. "They are ignorant; they are brutal; they are liars." I say that they are not liars, in any sense in which we, as a nation, are not so, Lord Macaulay to the contrary notwithstanding. Of their "brutality" take two examples. Birds, in freedom, will often continue to peck, unalarmed, while children of native India are playing among them. But once let an English child appear, and they are off in an instant. The instinct of the birds is not at fault. Again, in the Mutiny, our countrymen and countrywomen and their little children often owed everything to the unbought kindness and gentleness of the Native people, some of them very poor. The instances of this would fill a volume. As to their ignorance, no intelligent person who once witnessed a reading of the great epic of India, the Ramayan, would ever entertain this idea. The faces, upturned, in such case, to the reader, are like one mass of bright intellect.' . . . . 'Among my own friends in India was a young Brahmin, Neety Churn Udicurry, hereditary keeper (is it not ?) of Juggernaut's car. He came to see me about once a week, and we, at times, talked seriously of this wonderful world in which we had so strangely met. He was a clerk, in receipt of wages nothing near so high as those of an English day labourer. Yet he had a free night-school for boys, and his wife, I am almost sure (indeed I thought I was sure till I came to write it)—had a similar school for poor girls. He was poor. He was in all respects a gentleman.' . . . . [Speaking of Dr. Sircar.] 'Describing Dr. Sircar's house, my friend said it was like a large hospital, filled with free patients; and he asked me, in that merry way which some of you may know, if we could match that in England. Well, we have some large-hearted benevolence in England. We shall not deny that. Still there is something in Dr. Sircar's work which in many respects is exceptional. Before the young Indian students now in England were born, this virtuous, learned and enlightened man was labouring to establish in Bengal a great school of science and medicine, while at the same time he was doing for the poor such service as comes of a kind heart and a willing mind, but comes not to too great an extent in any land, in any one generation. Modestly, quietly —and without, I venture to say, even a comprehension of the *Me-and-I* philosophy—Dr. Sircar works his way. He might have been rich. I am sure that his money goes as fast as it comes, that his noble idea may live; that he may heal the broken-hearted, and bless the poor. Gentlemen,' [Indian students] 'I know no better example to hold up to you in view of your return to India.'—*Communicated by Mrs. Routledge, chiefly from a Lecture to Indian students delivered in April*, 1891.

[Is not this the Dr. Sircar who was killed in May, 1898, by the utterly unprovoked assault of British soldiers ?]

William H. Russell, LL.D. *War Correspondent and Author of 'Diary in India,' and other works; Indian War Medallist*, 1857-8. (*Writing in* 1883.)

'My small experience of India has led me to take a profound interest in the country and its people, and to appreciate the capacity of such men as Salar Jung and Madhao Rao in the highest work of government; but I am sorry to say our general knowledge of the greatest empire ever given to an alien race to rule for good has not been warmed by the breath of sympathy, without which the finest administrative talents are as hollow brass and tinkling cymbals. As I wrote in 1858-59, "If England loses India, it will be from want of sympathy with its people."'—*'Native Opinion,' Bombay, August* 20, 1899.

James Samuelson. *Author of 'India, Past and Present,'* (1890) *and other works.*

'The vast mass of the Natives are "religious," if by that is meant that they adhere strictly to their religious forms, customs, and ceremonies.' . . . . 'All are "affable" to the extent of occasionally laying themselves open to the charge of mendacity in saying what they think will please those whom they are addressing. They are "cheerful" and "grateful," and far more prone to suffer than to resent insult. I have never heard a Native even hint at the pain he must feel when he hears himself or his fellow countrymen abused by those who consider themselves a superior race.'—*'India, Past and Present,' James Saunderson, B.L.; Trübner and Co.*, 1890.

Frederick von Schlegel (1772-1829). *German Critic and Writer.*

'It cannot be denied that the early Indians possessed a knowledge of the true God; all their writings are replete with sentiments and expressions, noble, clear, and severely grand, as deeply conceived and reverently expressed as in any human language in which men have spoken of their God.' . . . . 'Among nations possessing indigenous philosophy and metaphysics, together with an innate relish for these pursuits, such as at present characterises Germany, and, in olden times, was the proud distinction of Greece, Hindustan holds the first rank in point of time.'—*'Thoughts on the Past and Future of India,' Manasukharâm Sûryarâm.*

Earl of Selborne, *Lord Chancellor of England.* (*Speaking in* 1883.)

'My lords, for some years I practised in Indian cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and during those years there were few cases of any Imperial importance in which I was not concerned. I had considerable opportunities of observing the manner in which, in civil cases, the Native judges did their duty, and I have no hesitation in saying—and I know this was also the opinion of the judges during that time—that the judgments of the Native judges bore most favourable comparison, as a general rule, with judgments of the English judges. I should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of English judges, who, as a class, are most anxious carefully to discharge their duty; but I repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that in every instance, in respect of integrity, of learning, of knowledge, of the soundness and satisfactory character of the judgments arrived at, the Native judgments were quite as good as those of English judges.'—*'New India; or, India in Transition,' H. J. S. Cotton, Bengal Civil Service; Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co.*, 1885.

Major Thomas Skinner, C.M.G. *Commissioner of Public Works in Ceylon.* (*Writing in* 1891.)

'Is it surprising that for such a people I should have conceived a deep attachment? This was the second generation of men for whom I felt the warmest possible affection, for with their fathers I had long lived on the most intimate terms, and they were specimens of nature's truest gentlemen. It was a source of pride and pleasure to me to witness so many of their sons worthily inheriting the virtues of their sires. I value intensely every memento that I hold from those dear people, and shall do so to the day of my death.'—*'Fifty Years in Ceylon,' Major Thomas Skinner, C.M.G.; W. H. Allen*, 1891.

Major-General Sir W. H. Sleeman. *Served in India,* 1808-1856. *Resident at Lucknow.*

'If by the term "public spirit" be meant a disposition on the part of individuals to sacrifice their enjoyments, or their own means of enjoyment, for the common good, there is, perhaps, no people in the world among whom it abounds so much as among the people of India. To live in the grateful recollection of their countrymen, for benefits conferred upon them in great works of ornament and utility, is the study of every Hindu of rank and property. Such works tend, in his opinion, not only to spread and perpetuate his name in this world, but through the good wishes and prayers of those who are benefited by them, to secure the favour of the Deity in the next. According to their notions, every drop of rain-water or dew that falls to the ground from the green leaf of a fruit-tree planted by them for the common good in this world proves a refreshing draught for their souls in the next. When no descendant remains to pour the funeral libation to their manes, the water from the trees they have planted for the public good is destined to supply the want. Everything judiciously laid out to promote the happiness of their fellow creatures will in the next world be repaid to them tenfold by the Deity. In marching over the country in the hot season, we every morning find our tents pitched on the green sward amid beautiful groves of fruit-trees, with wells of delicious water; but how few of us ever dream of asking at whose cost the trees that afford us and our followers such agreeable shade were planted, or the wells which afford us such copious streams of fine water in the midst of dry arid plains were formed?—when we go on enjoying all the advantages which arise from the noble public spirit that animates the people of India to benevolent exertions, without once calling in question the truth of the assertion of our metropolitan friends that "the people of India have no public spirit".'—*'Rambles and Recollections in India,' Major-General Sir W. H. Sleeman; H. Bohn*, 1844. *Supplied in MS. by Mr. Venkanah.*

Sir James F. Stephen. *Legal Member, Viceroy of India's Council*, 1869-72; *Author Indian Evidence Act, and standard legal works.*

'I think that all District and Sessions Judgeships, as well as the High Court Judgeships, should be thrown open and that the abler Natives should be appointed to them largely, especially in the quieter parts of the country. I believe that in this way it would be possible in the course of a few years to have a thoroughly good judicial service and a regularly organised legal profession, and in particular to make the service a bond of union between the Natives and ourselves. The Native appointments to the High Court of Calcutta have answered

admirably, and I hear on every side excellent accounts of the younger munshi's and the subordinate judges who have been educated in our universities.'—'*Selection of Records of Government of India (Home Department)*,' *No.* lxxxix, *p.* 49.

FIELD-MARSHAL SIR DONALD M. STEWART, Bart., G.C.B. *Served in India from* 1840; *Commander-in-Chief in India*, 1881-1885; *Member of Council of Secretary of State for India from* 1895.

'Above all, it was necessary that Englishmen should recognise that there were as clever people in India as in England. He advised those students who were going out to India to treat the Natives as they would their own countrymen, and they would find that the people of India were a very charming people. Personally, he was deeply grateful for all that the natives of India had done for him.'—'*India*,' *July* 28, 1899.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE AGRICULTURISTS.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, September 29.

In the course of the first reading of the Punjab Land Transfer Bill the Viceroy took the public into his confidence to the extent of stating that the relief of agricultural indebtedness was one of the twelve important Indian problems to which he has determined to apply himself during the term of his administration. This might, perhaps, have been guessed. The agrarian problem stands first in the front rank of all Indian problems. To persons conversant with British-Indian politics it is ever present. As years go by it assumes serious proportions, and the difficulty of its ultimate solution increases. It was nearly a quarter of a century ago that the late Sir Louis Malet, than whom no abler or more experienced permanent Secretary has ever been at the India Office, wrote a remarkable minute on the whole question of land revenue, discussing therein the policy of the Indian Government and pointing out its defects. The enhancement of revenue assessments then formed the principal topic of a prolonged controversy in the India Council, headed by Lord Salisbury himself as Secretary of State. In the concluding portion of his minute Sir Louis Malet observed with remarkable frankness and courage that the economic result of the land revenue policy pursued by the Government of India was fast bringing impoverishment on the peasantry. No wonder that, as a consequence, agricultural indebtedness was growing. And he wound up his statesmanlike minute, which gains fresh weight at this juncture, by telling the India Council in the plainest terms that every year the solution of this agrarian problem was delayed it would greatly aggravate the future task of the Government. We see to-day how prophetic was the vision of that late Under-Secretary, who had thoroughly mastered the problem, and had, besides, such deep and abiding sympathy for the Indians.

Lord Curzon now declares that his Government is going about in right earnest to grapple with the whole agricultural question. He avows his opinion that it would be unwise to palter with the fringe of it. If agricultural indebtedness is to be substantially relieved the question must be considered as a whole. His advisers tell him that the Punjab Land Transfer Bill is an honest and elaborate attempt on the part of his Government to deal most effectively with the hard lot of the Punjab agriculturist. The Bill is still in its first stage. The public are invited to offer their criticisms and suggestions, which will be carefully considered six months hence. So far it is praiseworthy of the Government of India to deal with the problem. But the question is whether the panacea they are now suggesting for the relief of the indebted rayat is the right one. Are they on the right track? Or are they merely wandering away from the true path to get themselves bewildered in another jungle of agricultural embarrassments of their own creation? It may be very good to prevent wholesale alienation of land. It may be an excellent check on usury to prescribe by law that no peasant can alienate his holding for more than fifteen years. It may be good for the prodigal rayat to curb his propensity to reckless borrowing. But is it likely that these measures will fulfil the object in view? Or is it likely that this very measure may induce new factors during its operation which may be productive of more mischief than good, so that the last state of the Punjab rayat will be worse than the first? And how is it that while the Government is prescribing such a doubtful panacea, it makes no effort to relax its rigid rules touching the payment of assessments, and takes no step to control the octopus of the Survey and Settlement Departments? What the peasant all over the country demands are easier assessments on dates when he is able to pay them, and a fixity of tenure short of permanent settlement. These demands are formulated by the Congress in a crystallised form and affirmed from year to year. But no attention is paid to them. The Indian Government will not diminish its land revenue. On the contrary, year in and year out it is energetically employed in one province or another in grabbing at larger revenue. The tales of oppressive enhancements are legion. Occasionally we hear of them in the form of interpellations at meetings of legislative councils; but the cry is feeble. The State by a summary law has cut the ground from under the feet of the complaining peasantry in the matter of appeals against enhancements. The ordinary law courts have no jurisdiction. The Commissioner and the Collector are the final court of appeal. They are both jury and judge. Hence it is that we do not hear of the complaints of the rayat regarding enhanced assessments. But the pinch is there, Sir James Caird put his fingers on the dark spots of land revenue policy in his able report separately submitted to Lord Salisbury. But they are ignored. And I say unhesitatingly that the Indian rayat generally is now in a worse plight every way than he was twenty-five years ago. Population has only increased at the normal rate. But for this increased population there is not enough food, despite all that the Director-General of Statistics and his optimistic followers may say in and out of the Press. Population is undoubtedly pressing on the means of subsistence and the number of those who scarcely get one full meal a day is growing. Thus the Government of India is missing the root of the malady and only applying its remedies to the surface. These remedies are foredoomed to failure. It may be very good of enthusiastic Viceroys to indulge in panegyrics of "the distinguished service," as the encyclopædia of human wisdom and statesmanship. But glowing periods never advance a country, though they may advance promotion, and elicit magnificent eulogies for the time being from a blind and ignorant Press. When the Bengal Tenancy Act was passed by Lord Dufferin in 1885, and then later a similar Act was passed for the North-West Provinces and for the Central Provinces, the like platitudes, though not perhaps quite so high-flown as those indulged in by Lord Curzon, were heard—mere bombast which collapsed as soon as it was uttered. What have been the effects of those measures? Have they proved of any utility to the rayat? Is he in any way better off? And how is it that these measures have had to be tinkered within a few years after their passing? Taking all these facts into consideration, one may say that from past experience much need not be expected from the new land measure for the relief of the Punjab rayat. In short, as Mr. Cotton, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, has observed in his "New India," while the rayat wants bread, the State prevents him with legislative stones which only go to burden the Statute-book.

In Bombay, the Government of Lord Sandhurst, after incubating for some ten years a measure of local self-government, has just introduced in the Legislative Council the District Municipalities Bill, the chief mark of which is its spirit of reaction. To the many plausible and smooth statements of Mr. James, the member in charge of the Bill, non-official members, representatives of the people, have made a capital rejoinder, pointing out the chief defects in the Bill. I specially commend to the attention of the public at home the thoughtful and effective speech of the Hon. Mr. N. G. Chandavarkar.

I must also mention the important letter of the Upper India Chamber of Commerce on the many disadvantages which local suppliers of stores suffer. They are discouraged while the monopolists who deal with the India Office are favoured. The letter shows what obstacles the authorities here put in the way of local suppliers—hard and impossible conditions which speak ill for their fairness and their concern for the interests of the taxpayers.

Finally, it is agreeable to find that *Capital*, in its issue of the 21st inst., is obliged to confess that financial adjustments need to be made between England and India in respect of military expenditure, which has grown to an appalling extent since 1885, and notably since 1891. Even *Capital* has to veer round to the views of the Congress.

AGRICULTURAL INDEBTEDNESS IN INDIA.

SPEECH BY LORD CURZON.

At the meeting of the Imperial Legislative Council, held at Simla on September 27, in introducing the Bill for amending the law relating to agricultural land in the Punjab, the Hon. Mr. Rivaz gave an interesting historical retrospect of the discussion in relation to land indebtedness, which has occupied the attention of the legislature and the public since Mr. Justice West of Bombay published in 1872 his pamphlet on "The Land and the Law in India." Special reference was made to the contributions made by Mr. Thorburn (now Financial Commissioner of the Punjab) both in his book published in 1886 on "Mahometans and Money-Lenders," and by the exhaustive report he wrote when appointed as Commissioner of Rawal Pindi Division by Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick to enquire regarding the indebtedness of the agricultural classes and the amount of land-alienation in the four assessment circles of the Western Punjab. While, however, as a consequence of Mr. Thorburn's enquiry, Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick proposed only to take powers bylaw to apply restrictions on transfer to any particular tract in which a full enquiry might show that they were required, the Government of India, swayed to a great extent by the opinion of the Financial Commissioners of the Punjab and the judge of the Punjab Chief Court, have decided in favour of an enactment of general application. The principal features of the proposed legislation are that all permanent transfers of land shall receive the previous sanction of the Revenue Officer, though that sanction shall be given as a matter of right when the transfer involves restoration by a non-agriculturist to another residing in the same district; and, secondly, that temporary alienations shall be limited to a period of fifteen years. Concluding, Mr. Rivaz said, that in introducing this measure they were merely reverting to some extent to the state of things which prevailed in the Punjab before it came under British rule, and the sole object was to check by remedial action an ever-increasing political danger.

THE VICEROY'S SPEECH.

Both the Viceroy and the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab spoke on the Bill.

His Excellency the Viceroy, said: The historical retrospect with which Mr. Rivaz commenced his interesting speech appeared to me to be of value in its general as well as its particular application. He showed that the question of agricultural indebtedness in many parts of India had attracted the attention of Government and had elicited the opinions of expert authorities at intervals throughout the present century, but that during the past twenty-five years it has become genuinely pressing and acute. Minutes have been written, resolutions have been circulated, and laws have been passed for the mitigation of the abuse; but all of these have dealt so to speak merely with the fringe of the subject, and only to-day are we engaged for the first time in introducing a measure of first-class legislative importance to check this great and growing evil. Does not this fact illustrate in a striking manner the method and deliberation with which we proceed? I am one of those, as may be known, who find that the machine of Government is apt to move somewhat slowly in this country, and to be a little ponderous and rusty in the revolution of its wheels. But for caution and slowness in a matter affecting vast areas of territory, relating to concrete rights of property, and touching the livelihood of hundreds of thousands, if not of millions, of the population, I have nothing but praise. Our studies and investigations can scarcely be too protracted, our action must on no account be flustered or precipitate. If our proposals are to be successful full opportunity must be afforded to public opinion to digest and to accept them, provided that is that they are deserving of acceptance. It is very important that the mills of the Sirkar should grind slowly, because in the long run they are apt to grind exceeding small.

Let me apply these observations to the present case. Mr. Rivaz has just asked leave to introduce this Bill, which has I may almost say been for years in the course of incubation. It represents the unanimous views of the Government of India; it has been accepted by the Secretary of State, it is supported, in the brief but powerful argument to which we have just listened, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province to which it is proposed to be applied; yet so conscious are we of the importance of the precedent that we are setting and of the far-reaching consequence of the solution that we propose, that we have resolved to give the amplest opportunity for the expression of opinions, and even of the criticisms of those whose interests will be affected by this measure. In my opinion legislation in this Council, which is invested with the law-making prerogatives of the Government of India, should be deliberate in proportion to its facility. Laws made in haste are apt to be repented at leisure. For these reasons we now introduce this Bill, which public and expert opinion will have ample opportunity of discussing during the next six months, and fortified as we hope by this outside assistance we shall then take up the measure when we re-assemble at Simla next year.

As regards the merits of the Bill itself I would make these observations. The issues at stake are in my judgment as momentous as any that can attract the attention of the Government of India. There is no country in the world so dependent on the prosperity of the agricultural classes as India. There is no Government in the world that is so personally interested in agriculture as the Indian Government. We are in the strictest sense of the term the largest landlords in creation. Our land revenues are the staple of our income. Upon the contentment and solvency of the millions who live upon the soil is based the security of our rule. In the present case we have all the greater responsibility from the fact that in the province of the Punjab with which we are now about to deal, we originated the present land system—which has had unfortunate consequences that it is proposed to rectify—as well as the legal system which has given the usurer his opportunity. A double responsibility therefore rests upon our shoulders. We cannot afford to see the yeoman farmers of the Punjab, the flower of the population and the backbone of the native army, dwindle and become impoverished before our eyes; neither can we acquiesce in the consummation of a social revolution which is in contradiction both of the traditions of Indian society and of the cardinal precepts of British rule. If it be asked why we have selected the Punjab as a field of this experiment, the answer is that there the problem is most serious, there the evil has reached or is reaching the most dangerous dimensions, and there it possesses a political and social as well as purely agrarian complexion. But our vision is not centred upon the Punjab alone. This canker of agricultural indebtedness, which is eating into the vitals of India, and which is one of the twelve questions that as I have remarked on a previous occasion, I have set before myself the humble intention to examine, and, if it may be, to attempt to solve, is not one of narrow or contracted application though in particular parts it may be more grave in its incidence than in others. We shall doubtless require to handle it in different ways in different areas. We began some years ago after a tentative fashion in the Deccan. We are now proceeding with a bolder venture in the Punjab. Should we be successful in this enterprise we shall be encouraged to proceed, and thus, stone by stone and layer by layer, to build up the fabric of financial and social stability for the rural population.

I do not shut my eyes to the fact that many objections can be and probably will be raised to this legislation. It will be said that we are taking away the right which we ourselves too generously conferred, that we are depreciating the values of land, which in my opinion have been unduly inflated, or that we are affecting the credit of a section of the population to whom a mistaken system has given an opportunity of borrowing up to the edge of their own ruin. I have in these few sentences indicated what would be the nature of my reply in each case, but I may add that even were these minor drawbacks to be realised—and I do not think that they will be to any appreciable extent—they must be weighed in the balance against the vastly superior advantages to the land-owning and agricultural community that we have in view, and they must be measured by the scale of the disaster which unless some drastic measures be taken will assuredly before long overwhelm the smaller zemindari classes of our population. I trust that in the public scrutiny to which we now commit this proposal these considerations of statesmanship may be borne in view and that it may be remembered that great and salutary ends are not apt to be secured by timid and temporising means.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

I.—ANGLO-INDIAN JOURNALS.

THE "CHAMPION."

What has the Commander-in-Chief in India to say? What has Lord Curzon to say? What has Lord George Hamilton to say? As politicians we look upon these two latter gentlemen with the greatest distrust and disfavour. But they are gentlemen, and we have yet to learn that they, having the power, will stand idly by while this scandal prevails. Moreover, apart from their characters as gentlemen, they are shrewd men of the world, and they must know that an incident of this description will have the most evil consequences, unless some steps are taken—and taken quickly—which will show to the Indian people that the honour of Indian women is as dear to them as is the honour of their own wives and sisters. And sincerely we know that the people of this country are alarmed and indignant. We, in our own small way, have received letters of the bitterest description in reference to this matter; so bitter that we hesitate to publish them. But they are significant, for they tend to show the intensity of public feeling. One correspondent wants to know what would have happened had this unfortunate woman been of the English race, and her assailants "black men."

THE "TIMES OF INDIA."

The atrocious character of the crime makes it lamentable that all attempts to bring the perpetrators to justice have failed up to the present. No one, we imagine, who has followed the evidence given at the trial, can doubt at this time of day that the unfortunate woman Mah Goon was outraged by several persons in broad daylight. Equally, there can be no doubt that the culprits were British soldiers, and belonged to the West Kent Regiment. Whether they are ever legally identified or not, they have placed a dark stain on the record of the regiment which will not be erased for many a year. And the disgrace of the West Kents casts a shadow upon the whole British Army in India . . . we cannot find any room for congratulation upon the tone of the defence at Rangoon. There is reasonable ground for suspicion that the authorities of the West Kent Regiment did not afford the civil power that full measure of assistance which might have been looked for. And it must be plainly said that in suggesting that the elderly Burmese woman was a vicious lunatic, the defence followed a line of argument which was not only discreditable, but cowardly. Other grave accusations brought against Mah Goon at earlier stages of the enquiry have been completely disproved; but it is not the least disagreeable feature of the case that in addition to the physical suffering and ignominy inflicted on her, she has had to face subsequent charges of a peculiarly scandalous character.

THE "PIONEER."

Leaving possible future developments of the case out of the question, it is a lamentable fact that up to the present time no one should have been brought to justice. The outrage was committed in the full light of day, close to the public road, and was witnessed by many men belonging to the West Kent Regiment, who apparently took no active

part in it. Nothing but a conspiracy of silence on the part of these men can have prevented the offence being brought home to the actual perpetrators, for the allegations as to the woman's actions before the offence cannot be regarded as justification of it. The men who were witnesses of what was done may have been deterred by a desire to shield their comrades, but whatever their motive their inaction has involved the whole regiment in the disgrace of an outrage which it would be hard to parallel. The action of the officers, in obtaining statements from the accused, though no doubt due to the best of motives, was also most unfortunate, since it effectually barred one door which might have led to important developments when the case was tried.

THE "FRIEND OF INDIA."

One more is thus added to the deplorably long list of brutal crimes of this and other kinds which have in recent years been perpetrated by European soldiers against Natives of India with absolute impunity and fresh confirmation is thus given to the rooted conviction that, in such cases, even-handed justice is not to be expected. That there has been a grievous miscarriage of justice in the present case can be questioned by no one. The only points open to doubt are, whether the verdicts of the jury in the cases tried were justified by the evidence put before them, and whether all was done that might have been done by the various authorities concerned to procure the conviction of the guilty person. . . . The mere fact that a succession of outrages of this kind, which from first to last must have occupied so long a time, could be perpetrated in broad daylight and in a public place, in the presence of a large number of soldiers and in defiance of a gathering crowd of wayfarers, without interference on the part of the regimental authorities, is proof presumptive of a degree of laxity of discipline which is eminently discreditable to the officers responsible for it Against isolated acts of violence by soldiers it may be impossible to guard without imposing on the liberty of the men restrictions which would be intolerable; but an open and persistent outrage like that in question shows either that the regiment in which it occurs is completely out of hand or that our military organisation as a whole is seriously defective. The circumstances of the outrage seem further to show the police arrangements in the Rangoon Cantonments to be wholly inadequate, and it is questionable whether, in their subsequent action, the police showed either the energy or the discretion which they ought to have done.

The "MADRAS MAIL."

As a contemporary remarks, the anxiety of the Native community to see punishments inflicted for this abominable deed is shared by all right-minded Europeans; yet the desire for the proper administration of the law must take precedence even of our indignation because men believed to be guilty of a shameful crime have escaped unpunished. It would be inconsistent with British justice to go behind the law relating to prisoners' confessions in order to snatch a conviction. The civil authorities, from the Viceroy downwards, have done all that was possible to bring the ruffianly offenders to book, and the military authorities have marked their sense of disgust by punitively transferring the whole regiment to Aden; but nevertheless the offenders themselves have gone scot-free so far as the law is concerned, though we may feel sure they have become marked men for all time in their regiment. We are loath to deal in any detail with an incident which in sheer depravity and grossness is unprecedented in the history of the British army, but we have felt bound to add our voice to those of our contemporaries in expressing the grief and humiliation which all Europeans in India must feel in regard to the matter.

THE "ENGLISHMAN."

We must of course bow to the decision of the jury which acquitted the third soldier placed upon his trial at Rangoon for taking part in the unspeakable outrage upon a Burmese woman. The leading principle of English law is that if there is any doubt in the case the accused must be given the benefit of it. It is stated that there is small probability of any further proceedings being taken. It has, therefore, been proved to be possible in a British cantonment in time of peace for an inoffensive female to be abused more barbarously than the women of an invaded territory in time of war; and this without any prospect of punishment for the brutes who committed the crime! On Tuesday we had to animadvert upon the failure of justice at Burdwan. But injustice is injustice whether the victim is Native or European.

II.—INDIAN JOURNALS.

THE "BENGALEE."

We have learnt with pleasure that the Viceroy has promptly called for the papers in Thorpe's case. We wish his Excellency every success in his righteous determination to put an end to such scandals. A few severe examples will be quite enough for the purpose. In the early days of British connexion with India, soldiers on the march, who touched the property of a Native, were flogged on the spot, and this seems to have had a completely deterrent effect. We do not wish for the revival of the cruel lash in these days. But in cases such as the Rangoon affair death will not be too severe a penalty to lay down. Is not the Government itself, however, partly responsible for the low conception which the British soldier has of Native women? Sometimes one cannot help feeling that the poor exile in uniform, often an out-cast from decent Anglo-Indian society, and the victim of a corrupting system, is more sinned against than sinning.

THE "INDU-PRAKASH."

There are more soldiers to be tried, but it is hoping against hope to expect any conviction, and the authorities might well drop further prosecutions. It is enough that everyone has now seen that a barbarous outrage was really committed by a number of soldiers on a poor woman, and that the West Kent Regiment, to which the culprits belonged, formed as successful a conspiracy of silence as to baffle all attempts to reach the offenders. We of course look for redress to the Viceroy, whose commendable interest in the case lies beyond praise. Departmental discipline may well step in where owing to its technicalities the law has proved powerless to have its revenge. But though the executive may ultimately find some method of giving to truth and justice their due, is it not remarkable that the law at times should be found to be so utterly impotent and feeble—we had almost said so divorced from reason and common sense? If we have followed the case rightly the prisoners escape not because there is an honest doubt as to their guilt, but because the law says that you shall not convict on the evidence of accomplices or on confessions which have the least semblance of having been influenced by any kind of hope of reward or fear of punishment held out by a superior.

THE "ADVOCATE OF INDIA."

It is to be hoped that those who have stood in the way of justice being done and in the way of the vindication of the honour of the Army will hear something more of their action in the matter. The results they have achieved are miserable in the extreme. The Royal West Kent is at the moment burdened with a gang of ruffians in its ranks that will make the presence of the regiment a danger in any civilised community, and, having been acquitted in a court of law, it is difficult to see how the military authorities can purge the regiment of so dangerous an element. The difficulties they are now placed in are largely due to their own action, but it is to be sincerely trusted that some way out of the quandary will be discovered and that the Queen's uniform will not be disgraced by being worn by the men who outraged Mah Goon.

THE "HINDU."

An elaborate official enquiry has put it beyond the possibility of a shadow of doubt that Mah Goon's character had never been anywise suspicious. In these circumstances, the points that have had to be determined, and remain yet to be determined, are: Which of the soldiers of the West Kent Regiment committed the outrage? and what evidence is there to bring the guilt home to the criminals? There is no question about the culpability of the regiment itself both in being responsible for the outrage and in maintaining a conspiracy of silence in regard to the actual offenders. There has been none since Horrock's acquittal. The transferring of the regiment itself to Aden is proof of it. No British Indian Government could be in a hurry to condemn a British regiment on the strength of so-called public opinion. The way that the cudgels were taken up by Lord Sandhurst in India and by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, during the Poona troubles, on behalf of Tommy Atkins is, if anything, a sure indication of the Government's partiality for the British soldier rather than its prejudice against him. And so the Indian Government could not have resolved upon the transfer of the regiment without the very best reasons for doing so.

THE "INDIAN MIRROR."

The Government Advocate in commenting upon the case against Johnson referred to the action of the military authorities as a conspiracy of silence. That is so. But the conspiracy may be justly stigmatised by a much uglier phrase. It is for the Commander-in-Chief to consider if the conduct of certain officers of the West Kent Regiment has been worthy of "officers and gentlemen," belonging to the British Army, and whether by suppressing proofs of the guilt of the soldiers, they might not be said to have in a manner partaken in the sin themselves. . . . . We wait with anxiety to see what action Lord Curzon now proposes to take in the matter. The greatest astonishment has been shown everywhere at the result of the Johnson trial. There can be no doubt that the Burmese population are wild about it. Such glaring failures of justice cannot but produce deplorable political results. But we have faith in Lord Curzon. He will not let himself be thus thwarted by a military conspiracy. We appeal to him in every confidence to take immediate action in the matter. For our part, we can only repeat the suggestion, we made at the time when Horrocks was acquitted, for the disbanding of the West Kent Regiment.

THE INDIAN EXCISE LAWS.

At the annual meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance, held at Manchester on Tuesday last, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, as a representative of the temperance movement in India, referred to his association as the representative of India with a resolution which had to do with the sufferings of women and children. He supposed it was because the 250,000,000 inhabitants of India, like the women and children of this country, had no votes, and therefore no Parliamentary voice. He congratulated the United Kingdom Alliance upon having outgrown their parochial conceptions of the blessings of temperance, upon having ceased to be Little Englanders, and upon having realised their Imperial position and stretched out their hand to India. (Cheers.) A few hours before he left Calcutta last September, at a representative meeting in that city a resolution was adopted appointing him a delegate of the friends of temperance in Bengal and India generally to the friends of temperance in England. "Tell them this," he was instructed, "on behalf of the 250,000,000 voiceless and voteless people of India, that England is responsible for the introduction of strong drink into India, and what England has done that is wrong England is in duty bound before God and its own conscience to try to undo." (Cheers.) He asked them in the name of God, in the name of their conscience, in the name of all they held dear, to remember that it was they, the people of England, who voted for members of Parliament and ruled India through those members of Parliament; it was they who would be held responsible at the bar of God and the bar of posterity if the inhabitants of India were ruined by strong drink. If he were to characterise the Indian excise laws as they deserved his language would probably be held in India to be sedition, and when he returned there he would be thrown into prison and kept there perhaps for three years without a trial. He would therefore not characterise them, but would only say that in every twenty years the excise revenues in India doubled. Friends of temperance knew what that meant, and all the degradation and domestic misery that it indicated. (Cheers.)

MR. ROMESH DUTT ON THE INDIAN EPICS.

The epic poetry of India was made the subject of a discourse by Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., at University College on Monday afternoon, as preliminary to his forthcoming course of lectures on the two gr at epics of ancient India. One of these, the Mahabharata, has been already introduced in condensed form to English readers Mr. Dutt (says the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*) admitted that the epics in their original form were inordinately long, but he contended that when all the episodal matter had been eliminated and the remaining narratives had been properly studied they would be recognised as among the greatest creations of any age and the best picture of ancient Indian life and society. Placing the epic age of India at the period between the fifteenth and tenth centuries before Christ, Mr. Dutt said that the epics which would form the subject of his lectures did for that age what the Greek poets had done for the epic period of Greece some centuries later. Just as among the cities of Greece Athens and Sparta had been especially conspicuous, so among the ancient Hindu races four had been extraordinarily remarkable, their contributions to science and philosophy being still esteemed in our own day. Making use of the same language and religion, they had formed a great confederation of Hindu nations. The wars which broke out amongst them after centuries of amity formed the centre about which the vast subject-matter of the epics had been grouped.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

The following Indian gentleman were included in the list of candidates who were declared by the Civil Service Commissioners to have shown a competent knowledge of the subjects of the final literary examination for the Indian Civil Service, but some of the candidates have not yet qualified in riding:—

No. on the List.	NAME.	Presidency or Division of Presidency to which assigned.	Marks obtained in the Final Examination.
1	Khan, Ghazanfur Ali	Upper Provinces	1,892
8	Deb, Manmatha Krishna ..	Lower ,,	1,615
12	Badhwar, Gokal Chand ..	Upper ,,	1,561
13	Roy, Jotindra Nath	Madras	1,555
23	Dutt, Charu Chandra	Bombay	1,428
34	Mehta, Byramjee Rustomjee	Lower Provinces	1,366
39	Dutt, Pratap Chandra.. ..	Madras	1,329

There were sixty-three successful candidates, the highest securing 1892 marks, while the lowest obtained 922 marks.

The seniority in the Civil Service of India of the selected candidates will be determined according to the order in which they stand on the list resulting from the combined marks of the Open Competitive and Final Examinations.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Last week Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, as was announced in INDIA, delivered a series of five addresses at Halifax, Milnrow, Whitworth, Middleton, and Colne.

On October 9, a public meeting was held at Stoken Church, when a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave a lantern lecture on "India and its People." The schoolroom was well filled by an attentive and appreciative audience.

On October 13, Miss Alison Garland gave an address on India at the Nottingham and County Liberal Club. Sir John Turney presided over a large and representative audience. The lecture was illustrated by lime-light views. Sir John and other speakers referred to Miss Garland's approaching visit to India, and said they hoped on her return to have another lecture descriptive of the Congress meetings at Lucknow.

Miss A. Garland has also dealt largely with Indian affairs in speaking at Watlington, Benson, and Keighley on Current Politics and the Transvaal question.

Among other prospective meetings which will be addressed on behalf of the British Committee are the following:—

October 16.—Bentham.
,, 18.—Prestwich.
,, 21.—Failsworth.
,, 24.—Ripponden.
,, 26.—Sowerby Bridge.
,, 27.—Otley.
November 1.—Gainsborough.
,, 6.—Aspatria.
,, 7.—Cockermouth.
,, 8.—Maryport.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, October 17.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Statistical Abstract)—Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1888-9 to 1897-8, thirty-third number. (During the recess.)

East India (Loans raised in England),—Copy presented—of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on September 30, 1899, etc., [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be *printed*. [No. 2.]

INDIA AND THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

Sir CHARLES DILKE, in the course of his speech on the Address, made the following reference to the removal of British troops from India to South Africa: With regard to the military preparations, they had seen the great readiness and celerity with which the Indian Empire had placed forces in the field, but he doubted very much whether it was wise on an occasion of this sort to draw upon the resources of our Indian Empire. This action would undoubtedly produce the greatest controversy in the future, and would create the impression in India that India was overtaxed for military purposes, and had to maintain an army which might very easily be drawn upon for service in other parts of the world. He should have preferred that exclusive reliance should have been placed on forces sent out from home.

Mr. DILLON in the course of his speech said that on more than one occasion he had drawn the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the *status* and treatment of the Indians in Natal. These Indians were as much her Majesty's subjects as the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, but the Colonial Secretary had refused to bring any pressure to bear on the Natal Government to secure their fair treatment because, the right hon. gentleman said, Natal was a self-governing colony. If that policy was to hold good for Natal because it was a self-governing colony, why should it not hold equally good for the Transvaal, which was more than a self-governing colony, for it was an independent State? (Hear, hear.)

Mr. PICKERSGILL, in the course of his remarks, said that there was no complaint of the Uitlanders which had not its counterpart in this country. The alleged oppression of the Uitlanders was overdone, and the *status* and treatment of Indian subjects in Natal was infinitely worse than the treatment of Natives in the South African Republic.

Wednesday, October 18.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

In the course of a discussion upon the course of business in connexion with the debate on the Address,

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN said that troops had been taken from India for the present expedition. He had no wish to bring Indian questions before the House, but he wished to have an assurance that the interests of India——

The SPEAKER: Order, order. This is for question time, if anything.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notices have been given of the following questions:—

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state whether any action has been taken by the Colonel of the Royal West Kent Regiment, or by the military authorities in India, with regard to the expulsion from that regiment of the men implicated in the outrage upon a respectable Burmese woman named Mah Goon at Rangoon. [*Thursday, October* 19.]

Mr. BUCHANAN: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can undertake that no part of the expenses connected with the despatch and transport of the forces from India to South Africa, or of their pay or maintenance during such service, shall be borne by the Indian revenues. [*Thursday, October* 19.]

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Calcutta Municipal Bill has been passed into law by the Bengal Legislative Council, and whether more than half the elected members of the present Corporation of Calcutta have resigned their seats as a protest against the action of the Government in reference to the Bill referred to:

And whether, in view of these circumstances, this House will have an opportunity of considering the provisions of the new law before it comes into operation in April next. [*Friday, October* 20.]

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The following notice of motion is on the Order paper of the House of Commons:—

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: As an amendment to the Address, at end add,—

And we humbly trust that the whole cost of the contingent sent from India to South Africa will be borne by the Imperial Exchequer and, in view of the reduction of military expenditure in India rendered possible by the amended policy beyond the North-West frontier, that the permanent cost of these troops will not again be imposed upon the Indian taxpayer.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c., ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. | 5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1899.

VOL. XI.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA," 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY, BRITISH COMMITTEE of the INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

---

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know

C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.

G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For **INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA,** etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,

C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.